## SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

The amendments are supported by pages 3 through 8 of the Specification. No new matter is believed to have been added to the application by these amendments.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14 remain active in this application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement is hereby submitted, listing all references previously improperly incorporated into the specification. All references listed are enclosed for the Examiner's consideration.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Applicant hereby submits amended drawings that display the manner in which the second end of the horizontally oriented portion of the invention becomes a substitute or replacement for the tool's housing. Further, the Specification has been modified to describe this in greater detail. The rejection of Claims 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is believed to be obviated by the amendments submitted above.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14, as amended, distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as his invention. All elements of each Claim are clearly defined, supported in the Specification, and have sufficient antecedent basis to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the Applicant's invention, and to understand what is and what is not claimed by the Applicant.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent 3,140,071 by Lorentzen is believed to be obviated by the clarification of claim 1 to recite that the apertures are not axially aligned. In contrast, the apertures disclosed in Lorentzen are axially aligned, with one such aperture serving no other function than to permit a screw to be passed entirely through it to reach the second aperture (Figure 4, and column 2, lines 56-59). In the present invention, Figures 1-4 clearly show that apertures 24a, 24b, and 24c are used for fastening the hanger to the tool in a way that

prevents rotation of the hanger relative to the tool. This distinction is critical, as the axially aligned apertures disclosed by Lorentzen would not prevent rotation of a tool hanger in the same manner and to the same degree as the present invention, even assuming that both axially aligned apertures of Lorentzen were engaged by a fastener.

The rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorentzen because threading of one or more apertures would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art is respectfully traversed. Specifically with respect to Lorentzen, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill would not thread any of the apertures disclosed by Lorentzen, because such threading would likely provide no additional benefit, since the bracket is attached by screws. In the present invention, threading allows the hanger to be used to replace part of the tool, such as the tool's end cap, which is frequently attached by machine screws, thereby requiring internal threading. Additionally, internal threading may be advantageous in those situations where the hanger is connected to a pneumatic tool. Such threading would prevent air leaks where the hanger joins with the tool and/or pneumatic fitting. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that since current comparable hangers do not even acknowledge these problems, the solutions provided by threaded apertures in the present invention are nonobvious.

The rejection of Claims 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Lorentzen because making one or more of the apertures non-circular would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art is respectfully traversed. As disclosed in the present invention, a properly sized non-circular aperture prevents rotation of the hanger relative to the tool to which it is attached. In this way, a non-circular aperture functions in a fundamentally different manner than a circular aperture. Apertures (29) of Lorentzen are not intended to prevent rotation in this manner.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (listed as 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in the Office Action) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent 6,010,103 to Ashworth is respectfully traversed. Examiner's contention that adding additional apertures would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art does not acknowledge that a device such as a hanger connected by one circular aperture operates in a fundamentally different manner than such a device connected by two such apertures, since two apertures prevent rotation of the device. It could be argued that there may be times when a hanger capable of rotation

would be preferable to the present invention, where rotation is prevented. Since the present invention functions in such a different manner, Applicant respectfully submits that the use of more than one aperture is nonobvious.

The rejection of Claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being anticipated by Ashworth is respectfully traversed. As discussed above, a non-circular aperture functions in a fundamentally different manner than a circular aperture, in that it prevents rotation in the absence of any force of compression. The Ashworth device, with one circular aperture, is incapable of preventing rotation in the absence of significant force of compression. Applicant notes that Ashworth does not even discuss rotation of the hanger as an issue. Since a pivotal feature of the present invention is the fact that the hanger does not rotate, Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is nonobvious relative to Ashworth.

In view of these amendments, withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean T. Woodward

Registration Number 47,185

16 St. Andrews Ct. Durham, NC 27707

Telephone (919) 402-1473